



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,699	04/21/2004	Karen M. Cheves	1001.1705101	5388
28075 7590 05/10/2007 CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC 1221 NICOLLET AVENUE SUITE 800 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55403-2420			EXAMINER GILBERT, ANDREW M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3767	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/828,699

Applicant(s)

CHEVES ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew M. Gilbert

Art Unit

3767

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 15 and 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/28/2007 has been entered.

Acknowledgements

2. This office action is in response to the reply filed 2/28/2007.
3. In the reply, the Applicant cancelled claims 1-3, 5-14, 16-24 and amended claims 4 and 15. Claim 25 remains withdrawn.
4. Additionally, the Applicant persuasively argued that nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection to claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/447766 is improper in view of the amendment and that the claims are patentably distinct in the applications. Thus, the rejection has been withdrawn.
5. Thus, claims 4 and 15 are pending for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 4 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vigil et al (5320634) in view of Parodi (5250070).

8. In reference to claim 4, Vigil et al discloses a medical device, comprising: an elongate shaft (14) having a proximal end, a distal end, a first lumen (14) extending therethrough, and a second lumen (col 4, lns 63-64) extending therethrough; a balloon (12) coupled to the shaft, the balloon having a first inflated configuration and a second non-inflated configuration, wherein the balloon has a plurality of wings formed therein when in the second configuration (Fig 3b); and one or more cutting members affixed to the balloon (31), the one or more cutting members each having a longitudinal axis (Figs 3a, 4a-b), wherein the one or more cutting members each include a traction region that is configured to improve traction between the balloon and a target site (Figs 3a, 4a-b; and previous discussion of "traction region" in paragraphs 4-7 of the Final office action mailed on 11/1/2006). In reference to claim 15, Vigil et al additionally discloses a cutting blade (31) affixed to the balloon (Fig 3a-b; 4a-b), the cutting blade including means for cutting and means for gripping thereon and having a longitudinal axis (Fig 3a-b, 4a-b).

9. However, Vigil et al fails to expressly disclose wherein the cutting member/blade has a traction region/cutting blade defined by a series of undulations curving from side to side relative to the longitudinal axis.

10. Parodi teaches that it is known to have the traction region/cutting blade defined by a series of undulations curving from side to side relative to the longitudinal axis (Fig 6c, summary, col 3, lns 2-col 4, lns 11) for the purpose of providing a nonskidding

balloon surface that minimizes trauma to the whole endothelium (Summary, col 4, lns 3-11). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the traction region as taught by Vigil et al with the traction region defined by a series of undulations curving from side to side relative to the longitudinal axis in the cutting members as taught by Parodi for the purpose of a nonskidding balloon surface that minimizes trauma to the whole endothelium (Summary, col 4, lns 3-11).

11. Claims 4 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lary (6306151) in view of Parodi (5250070).

12. In reference to claim 4, Lary discloses a medical device, comprising: an elongate shaft (10) having a proximal end, a distal end, a first lumen (Fig 7) extending therethrough, and a second lumen (Fig 2) extending therethrough; a balloon (13) coupled to the shaft, the balloon having a first inflated configuration and a second non-inflated configuration, wherein the balloon has a plurality of wings formed therein when in the second configuration (Fig 6); and one or more cutting members affixed to the balloon (Fig 4, 9), the one or more cutting members each having a longitudinal axis (Fig 4, 9), wherein the one or more cutting members each include a traction region that is configured to improve traction between the balloon and a target site (Fig 4, 9; and previous discussion of "traction region" in paragraphs 4-7 of the Final office action mailed on 11/1/2006), wherein the traction region is defined by a series of undulations in the cutting members (Fig 9). In reference to claim 15, Lary additionally discloses a

cutting blade affixed to the balloon (Fig 4, 9), the cutting blade including means for cutting and means for gripping thereon and having a longitudinal axis (Fig 4, 9).

13. However, Lary fails to expressly disclose wherein the cutting member/blade has a traction region/cutting blade defined by a series of undulations curving from side to side relative to the longitudinal axis.

14. Parodi teaches that it is known to have the traction region/cutting blade defined by a series of undulations curving from side to side relative to the longitudinal axis (Fig 6c, summary, col 3, lns 2-col 4, lns 11) for the purpose of providing a nonskidding balloon surface that minimizes trauma to the whole endothelium (Summary, col 4, lns 3-11). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the traction region as taught by Lary. with the traction region defined by a series of undulations curving from side to side relative to the longitudinal axis in the cutting members as taught by Parodi for the purpose of a nonskidding balloon surface that minimizes trauma to the whole endothelium (Summary, col 4, lns 3-11).

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4, 15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Melsheimer (2006/0178685).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew M. Gilbert whose telephone number is (571) 272-7216. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am to 5:00 pm Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Sirmons can be reached on (571)272-4965. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Andrew Gilbert

KEVIN C. SIRMONS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

